

## **REMARKS**

Claims 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13, 14, and 16-34, are pending in the application. Claims 6, 10, 14, 21, 25, and 27 are independent. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

### **I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 21-34 are allowed. Additionally, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 7, 11, and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

### **II. Claim Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Niikawa in view of Hirasawa. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

#### **Independent Claims 6, 10 and 14**

With respect to independent claims 6, 10 and 14, the Office takes the position that “[i]n light of the teachings of Hirasawa, it would have been obvious ... to modify the system of Niikawa to include the ability to move the status display within the LCD, because an artisan of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that this would allow the user to move the camera status display if it were to interfere with the image being displayed.”


The problem with this reasoning is that the status information disclosed in Niikawa never interferes with the image being displayed. For example, as shown in FIGS. 8 and 16A, the status information does not interfere with the image. Accordingly, there is no motivation to modify the system of Niikawa to include a means to move the status information so that the information does not interfere with an image because the system of Niikawa never suffers from the problem of the status information interfering with the image. Why would someone be motivated to modify a system that is not in need of modification? Because there is no motivation to modify Niikawa based on the teachings of Hirasawa, the

rejection of claims 6, 10 and 14 (and all of the claims that depend therefrom) should be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Brian Rosenbloom, Registration No.: 41,276				
SIGNATURE				DATE	3/1/06
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031